



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/810,481	03/19/2001	Katsumi Ikegami	OHG 123	8966

7590 05/31/2005

RABIN & CHAMPAGNE, P.C.
Suite 500
1101 14th Street
Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER

STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/810,481

Applicant(s)

IKEGAMI, KATSUMI

Examiner

Kyle R Stork

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 19, 20, 33, 34, 48-51 and 55-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 19, 20, 33, 34, 48-51 and 55-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 March 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This non-final office action is in response to the interview conducted 25 April 2005, and the election filed 28 March 2005.
2. Claims 1-7, 19-20, 33-34, 48-49, 50-51, and 55-58 are pending. Claims 1, 19, 48, and 58 are independent claims.

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the elements stored within a document format database as described in the specification. The applicant's specification discloses storing a wide array of information within the database, however, Figure 13 only discloses storing coordinates.
5. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Figures 13, 27, 40, 42, 53-54, and 57 do not have element numbers necessary for the understanding of the invention.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate

Art Unit: 2178

prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-7, 20, 49, and 55-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. Claims 1, 20, 56 and 58 recites the limitation "the function"/"the functions," "same," "the department title"/"the respective reader," and "the functions." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2178

9. The terms "synthesizes" and "perceivable" in claims 3 and 49 are relative terms which renders the claim indefinite. The terms are not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claims not specifically addressed above are rejected for their dependence upon a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-2, 19-20, 33-34, 48, 50, 55, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ernst (Using Netscape, 1995).

As per independent claim 1, Ernst discloses an image display system comprising:

- Original image holding device for holding original image data (page 51: Here, the inline images are the original image. These images are stored and "read from across the Internet")

Art Unit: 2178

- An image display device connected to the original image holding device (Figure 3.6: Here, Netscape is a browser acting as an image display device for displaying images and data from the Internet)
- Storing device for storing image data obtained by converting the original image data and suitable for display by the image display; wherein:
 - The image display device has the function of reading out and displaying image data from the storing device, and detecting alterations to the image data when the image data is read out (pages 50-51: Here, the user can turn off inline images. Original image data will then be converted to an inline image icon)
 - The image display device has the functions of, if alteration to the image data is detected, requesting the original image holding device to transfer original image data (pages 50-51: Here, if the user chooses the “Load Images command” then the original image is requested from the Internet)
 - Original image holding device has a function of transferring original image data to the image display device, in accordance with original image data transfer requests from the image display device (pages 50-51: The original image is obtained from the Internet, in order to be displayed as in inline image)
 - The image display device has a function of displaying the original image data transferred thereto (pages 50-51: Here, the inline images are requested and loaded for display in the Netscape browser)

As per dependent claim 2, Ernst discloses the system wherein the image display device has the function of displaying an indication that original image data has been obtained since there has been an alteration to the image data, along with displaying the original image data transferred thereto (pages 50-51: Here, the altered image data is the Inline Image icon that is displayed when the user has Inline Images turned "off." However, the user can request the Inline Images simply by clicking on the "Images" button. This retrieves the inline images and displays them once they have been downloaded from the Internet).

As per independent claim 19, Ernst discloses an image display system for document management comprising an image registration terminal device, server, and reading terminal device manually linked by means of a network, wherein:

- (A) the image registration terminal device comprises:
 - a first input section for converting original image data for a document that is to be disclosed into image data (pages 50-51: Here, a user inputs the selection to display the inline image icon as opposed to the original inline image)
 - a first screen display section capable of displaying the image data, and set regions specified as prospective non-disclosure regions within the image data region of the image data (pages 50-51: Here, the non-disclosure region is the original image. The original image is converted to the inline image icon, which is disclosed in the place of the original image)

Art Unit: 2178

- (B) the server obtains and stores the image data and setting data for the set regions from the image data registration terminal device (pages 50-51: Here, the Internet stores images and settings for a web page)
- (C) the reading terminal device comprises:
 - a second input section for reading out the image data and setting data from the server (pages 50-51: Here, a browser obtains the image data through the Netscape browser from a server connected to the Internet)
 - a region section for deciding disclosed regions in the image data region (page 50-51: Here, the browser determines if the reading terminal has the "Auto Load Image command" turned on or off. If it is on, then the original image is displayed. If it is off, then the original image is converted to the inline image icon is displayed)
 - a second screen display section capable of displaying the image data, the regions and no-disclosure decided regions within the image data region (page 49: Here, a user can open a plurality of Netscape browser windows, all capable of displaying image data)

As per dependent claims 20, Ernst further discloses the system wherein:

- (A) the image registration terminal device further comprises:
 - prospective non-disclosure region setting device for creating setting data for the set region (pages 50-51: Here, the "Auto Load Image command" is the setting that determines the non-disclosure of the image)

Art Unit: 2178

- a first memory for storing image data and setting data in a readable fashion (page 50-51 and 53: Here, Netscape retrieves multimedia files and stores them in temporary memory. Further, the retrieved information is stored on the Internet)
- a first output section for reading out the image data and setting data from the first memory and outputting (pages 50-51: Here, the browser displays the image data)
- the first output section comprising the first screen display section (pages 50-51)
- (B) the reading terminal device further comprises:
 - a disclosure data creation section for converting image data with the non-disclosure decided regions to non-readable data, converting image data within the disclosed region to readable data, and creating disclosure data consisting of the non-readable and readable data (pages 50-51: Here, the browser renders the non-disclosure images as inline image icons. Further, the disclosure data, in this case text, is readable)
 - a second output section for converting the disclosure data to a disclosure document having perceivable contents (pages 49-51: Here, a user may have as many Netscape browser windows open as the user's system will allow. Further, disclosure data is perceivable through the Netscape browser)

- a second memory for storing, in a readable fashion, the image data, the setting data, the readable and non-readable data, and the disclosure data (pages 53-59: Here, the ability to save web pages and web page data from Netscape to memory is disclosed)
- a second output section comprising the second screen display section (page 49)

As per dependent claim 33, Ernst discloses the system wherein:

- the first screen display section is capable of displaying structured image data created from the image data and setting data for the set regions (pages 50-51: Here, the Netscape browser displays the inline image or the inline image icon based upon the stored settings)
- the server obtains and stores the setting data for the set regions, and the structured image data (pages 50-51: Here, the data obtained by the Netscape browser, including data settings is stored on the Internet)
- the second screen display section is capable of displaying disclosure data consisting of the non-readable data, obtained by converting the image data in the disclosure region to readable data (pages 49-51: Here, the user may have plurality of browser windows. Each of the browser windows is capable of converting non-readable data, in this case inline image icon data, into readable data, in this case the original image, by selecting the "Images" button)

As per dependent claim 34, Ernst discloses the system wherein:

- (A) the image registration terminal device further comprises:

Art Unit: 2178

- prospective non-disclosure region setting device for creating setting data for the regions (pages 50-51: Here, the inline image icon is displayed when inline images are turned off, or set as non-disclosed. This is set through the "Options" menu)
- a structured image data creating section for creating the structured image data (page 51: Here, the Inline Image icon is the structured image data that is created and substituted in place of the inline image)
- a reference data creating section for creating reference data for referencing the set regions within the structured image data (pages 50-51: Here, each Inline Image icon is associated with inline image data)
- a first memory for storing the image data, the structured image data, the setting data and the reference data in a readable fashion (page 50-51 and 53: Here, Netscape retrieves multimedia files and stores them in temporary memory. Further, the retrieved information is stored on the Internet)
- a first output section for reading out the structured image data, setting data, and reference data from the first memory and outputting (pages 50-51 and 263: Here, Netscape browser retrieves, displays, and stores data)
- wherein the first output section contains the first screen display section (pages 50-51: Here, data is output through the Netscape browser)
- (B) the reading terminal device further comprises:

- a region deciding section for creating the image data on the basis of the structured image data, the setting data and the reference data read out from the server, and the setting disclosed regions and non-disclosed regions with respect to the set regions in the image data region of the image data (pages 50-51: Here, the Netscape browser displays the information with respect to the disclosed location of the data)
- a disclosure data creating section for creating the disclosure data by converting image data within the non-disclosure deciding regions to the non-readable data in addition to the readable data conversion (pages 50-51: Here, when Inline Images are turned “off,” then the Inline Image icon, a non-readable data format, is inserted in place of the Inline Image)
- a second output section for converting the disclosure data to a disclosure document having perceivable contents (pages 50-51: Here, after the Inline Image icon has been displayed, a user can choose to have the perceivable Inline Images displayed by selecting the “Images” button)
- wherein the second output section contains the second screen display section (pages 49-51: Here, the user may have plurality of browser windows. Each of the browser windows is capable of converting non-readable data, in this case inline image icon data, into readable data, in this case the original image, by selecting the “Images” button)

As per independent claim 48, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 19. Ernst further discloses authorization levels (pages 141-149: Here,

Art Unit: 2178

telnet requires a user to have proper authorization levels to obtain certain data stored on servers). Claim 48 is similarly rejected under Ernst.

As per dependent claim 50, Ernst discloses the system wherein:

- the first screen display section is capable of displaying structured image data created from the image data and setting data (pages 50-51: Here, the setting data indicates to the Netscape browser whether it should load Inline Images or the Inline Image icon)
- the server previously registers reading authorization level correspondence data and item name correspondence data relating to the reading authorization levels, and it also obtains and stores the structured image data in place of the image data and setting data for the regions from the image registration terminal (pages 141-149; pages 50-51)
- the second input section reads out the structured image data, the reading authorization level correspondence data and the item name correspondence data, from the server (pages 50-51 and 141-149)
- the second display screen display section is capable of displaying readable item names, and disclosure data consisting of the non-readable data and readable data, obtained by converting the image data in the disclosure region to readable data (pages 49-51: Here, the non-readable Inline Image icons can be converted to readable inline images by the user's selection of the "Images" button)

As per dependent claim 55, Ernst discloses the system wherein:

Art Unit: 2178

- reader level data for specifying reader levels in relation to particular setting data elements of the setting data is previously registered in the server (pages 144-147: Here, a user must log in to gain access to the data)
- the region deciding section comprises a direct deciding section which sets disclosed regions and non-discloses regions within the image data region, directly, by specifying a reader level in the reader level data read out from the server by the second input section (pages 50-51 and 144-147: Here, a user cannot access data unless he/she is logged in. Once the user is logged in, then he/she can access data)

As per independent claim 58, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claim 58 is similarly rejected under Ernst.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ernst and further in view of Chang et al. (US 6532541, filed 1999, patent 2003, hereafter Chang).

As per dependent claim 3, Ernst discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ernst discloses a system wherein:

Art Unit: 2178

- The image display device sends an original image transfer request (pages 50-51: Here, the "Images" icon requests the images for display)
- The original image storing device sends original image data (pages 50-51: Here, the Netscape browser pulls the image from the Internet)
- The image display device synthesizes the image (pages 50-51: Here, the inline images can be loaded into the browser window for display)

Ernst fails to specifically disclose detecting alterations of a region within the image. However, Chang discloses detecting alterations of a region within an image (column 1, lines 29-47: Here, a digital signature and a watermark detect alterations to regions of an image).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ernst's system with Chang's system, since it would have allowed a user to distinguish between an original image and an altered image (column 1, lines 8-12).

As per dependent claim 4, Ernst and Chang disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Chang further discloses the system wherein the image display device detects alterations to image data by means of the presence or absence of an electronic watermark (column 1, lines 29-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ernst and Chang's system with Chang's system, since it would have allowed a user to distinguish between an original image and an altered image (column 1, lines 8-12).

Art Unit: 2178

As per dependent claim 5, Ernst and Chang disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Chang further discloses the system wherein the plurality of regions are blocks obtained by uniform division of the image data; and the image display device detects alteration for each of the blocks (column 1, lines 29-47: Here, the each region is broken down into individual pixels. The bit values are determined and used to generate a checksum. If the checksum value before and after transmission are equal, then the image is considered verified).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ernst and Chang's system with Chang's system, since it would have allowed a user to distinguish between an original image and an altered image (column 1, lines 8-12).

14. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ernst and Chang and further in view of Microsoft® Excel 2000 (1999, hereafter Excel).

As per dependent claim 6, Ernst and Chang disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ernst and Chang fail to specifically disclose the system wherein the plurality of regions are description regions based on a document format database. However, Excel discloses a plurality of regions based on a document format database (Figure 2: Here, several document regions can be stored in the database in accordance with applicant's Figure 13).

Art Unit: 2178

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ernst and Chang's system with Excel's system, since it would have allowed a user to easily query data for retrieval.

As per dependent claim 7, Ernst, Chang, and Excel disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ernst further discloses sending co-ordinates information for the image display data stored in the storage device (pages 50-51: Here, the co-ordinates disclose where the inline image will be displayed); the original image storing device reads out the original image data for the corresponding region on the bases of the co-ordinate information and transferring original image data to an image display device (pages 50-51).

15. Claims 49 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ernst and Hahn (Student Guide To Unix Second Edition, 1996) and further in view of applicants admitted prior art.

As per dependent claim 49, Ernst discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 48, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ernst further discloses the system wherein:

- (A) the image registration terminal device further comprises:
 - prospective non-disclosure region setting device for creating setting data for the region (pages 50-51)
 - a first memory for storing the image data and setting data in a readable fashion (pages 49-51)

Art Unit: 2178

- a first output section for reading out the image data and setting data from the first memory and outputting (pages 49-51)
- first output section contain the first screen display (pages 49-51)
- (C) the reading terminal device further comprises:
 - a non-disclosed region deciding section for specifying disclosed regions and non-disclosed regions
 - a disclosure data creating section for converting image data within the non-disclosure deciding regions to non-readable data, converting image data within the disclosed regions to readable data, and creating disclosure data consisting of the non-readable and readable data (pages 49-51)
 - a second output section for converting the disclosure data to a disclosure document having perceivable contents (pages 50-51)
 - a second memory for storing, in a readable fashion, the image data, setting data, and readable and non-readable data, and disclosure data (pages 50-51)
 - the second output section contains a second display section (pages 49-51)

Ernst fails to specifically disclose:

- index data relating to the image data comprising indexing keywords, and image data tag names and attribute names

Art Unit: 2178

- the index data relating to the set regions comprising a region number, two-dimensional co-ordinate values, region width and region height for the set regions, and name attributes indicating the item names relating to the set regions
- (B) the server previously registers reading authorization levels correspondence data and item name correspondence data relating to the reading authorization levels
- authorization levels

However, Hahn discloses:

- (B) the server previously registers reading authorization levels correspondence data and item name correspondence data relating to the reading authorization levels (pages 25-30 and 618-622)
- authorization levels (pages 25-30 and 618-622)

The applicant discloses as well known in the art:

- index data relating to the image data comprising indexing keywords, and image data tag names and attribute names (page 5, lines 3-21)
- the index data relating to the set regions comprising a region number, two-dimensional co-ordinate values, region width and region height for the set regions, and name attributes indicating the item names relating to the set regions (page 5, lines 3-21)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ernst's system with Hahn's system, since it would have easily allowed a user to restrict access to files through file permissions

Art Unit: 2178

(Hahn: pages 621-622). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ernst and Hahn's system with the applicant's system, since it would have allowed a user to automatically generate search criteria.

As per dependent claim 51, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 49. Claim 51 is similarly rejected under Ernst, Hahn, and the applicant's admitted prior art.

16. Claims 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ernst and further in view of Hahn (Student Guide To Unix Second Edition, 1996).

As per dependent claim 56, Ernst discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 55, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ernst fails to specifically disclose the system wherein the reader level data is data which is structured with respect to the reader level, reader name, and department title of the respective reader. However, Hahn discloses the system wherein the reader level data is data which is structured with respect to the reader level, reader name, and department title of the respective reader (pages 618-622: Here, a document owner is able to set permissions for data based upon the reader level, the system administrator has access to all files stored on the system based upon the system administrator's level; the reader name, the reader has access based upon being the owner, in a specific group, or a general user; and department, the department is equivalent to group).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ernst's system with Hahn's system, since it would have easily allowed a user to restrict access to files through file permissions (Hahn: pages 621-622).

As per dependent claim 57, Ernst discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 55, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ernst fails to specifically disclose the system wherein in cases where a user name for the reader and a password for the reader are previously stored in the reader level data, as a registered user name and a registered password, the region deciding section further comprises a comparing section for comparing the registered user name and registered password read out from the server by the second input section with a user name and password input by the reader by means of the second input section and if the comparison performed by the comparing section produces a match, then the direct deciding section specifies the reader level for the matching reader name. However, Hahn discloses the system wherein in cases where a user name for the reader and a password for the reader are previously stored in the reader level data, as a registered user name and a registered password, the region deciding section further comprises a comparing section for comparing the registered user name and registered password read out from the server by the second input section with a user name and password input by the reader by means of the second input section and if the comparison performed by the comparing section produces a match, then the direct deciding section specifies the reader level for the matching reader name (pages 25-30 and 618-622).

Art Unit: 2178

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ernst's system with Hahn's method, since it would have allowed a user to easily log in to a system to retrieve stored data.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Rhoads et al. (US 6614914): Discloses watermark embedder and reader.
- Rhoads (US 6879701): Discloses tile-based digital watermarking.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (703) 308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krS


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER